G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.
L. R

1889.
~~191~~ .
(L. R)

File No. 45 of 89.

Serial Nos. 1 - 5

Later references.
L. R. 5 12 of 02.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 - 5

Part B for December 1890.

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Subbaraya, late Shanbhog of Madwagere for certain irregularities in regard to the disposal of his lands.

(Indexed) Mirza Nazeer Hussain

W D 1351—GPB—20,000—13-12-15

1

Appeal Petition No. 2792 of
20th March 1890.

Appellant
Subbaraya late Shanbogue &
Madavagere Mysore Taluk.

Appellants Petition complaining of certain irregularities on the part of the Mysore Amr. Chengalrelli & three Others in regard to the disposal of his lands having been forwarded to the Dy Comr. of the Mysore Dt. a reply was received from that Officer vide his Docket No. 893 dy 7th Octr. 90 submitting an English memorandum together with the vernacular papers bearing on the case received from the 2nd Gen. Asst. Comr. containing replies to the several points referred to in the Petrs. Complaint —

In reply to his Petition
Petitioner was informed
by an endorsement that
as he when heard in person
was not able to state
exactly what his com-
plaint was, and that as
the records received do
not shew that any injustice
was done to him his
Petition was rejected—

Section L.R.

File No. 4 5 4 1 1 2

Sub No. 1

Petitioner is not present.
Petitioner's counsel appears
& represents the case
in person or by a duly
authorised agent.

ہوئے ہیں۔ ان کے ساتھ ہی ان کے بھائی بہن بھی ہیں۔ ان کے والد کا نام
ہے۔ ان کے والد کا نام ہے۔ ان کے والد کا نام ہے

No 215 8

5-7-90

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Section LR

File No 45983

Serial No 2

The accompanying Petition No. 2792 dated 20th March/90 received at the Dewan's Office from Subbaraya Late Shanbogue of Madavapere, residing at Varana, Mysore Taluk is forwarded, together with its (7) Seven enclosures, to the Dy: Commissioner of the Mysore District for the Submission of the proceedings and a brief report.

Drafted as per Councillor's order

By Order,

Chief Secretary

BANGALORE,

3-7-1890.

5

4

(General Serial No. 31).

1890

6886
16.OCT.90
951

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE
MYSORE
DISTRICT

From

Section L. R

File No 45 of 89

Serial No 3

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt. of Mysore.

Dated 7 October 1890.

Despatched 8

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file - V. Papers in separate packet

General No. 893

No.

With reference to his Special Memorandum No 21/5 dated 20th March 1890, calling for a brief report to be laid before the Council of Ministers

Returned 14/10/90

Submitted to the Council 17/10/90 AGP

dismissed Hamburg who has been criminally prosecuted and convicted of embezzlement.

3. The enclosures of this official Memorandum noted above are herewith returned.-

G. Van Kleyck
Deputy Commissioner
Myrae Dietz.

10

Memo

Reference

Deputy Commissioner's docket No 1346 dated 19th July 1890 calling for a report on a petition submitted to the Diwan by Soobraya & Shanbogue of Vanna Mysore Taluq - The items of Complaint and the Amildar's replies are given in first la portion

The Petitioners complains against certain parties and calls them defendants as follows,

1st Amildar Chengiachetty
2nd & 3rd Gumasta Ramappa
3rd Rev: Gumasta aswath Row
4th Shanboy Gumasta
Venkatta Ramanayah

Items of Complaint

(1) That the no and situation of his Pattah Lands have been changed No & Annuation has been made in his presence & he has been defrauded

Replies

Notice issued to petitioner to attend when his statement was to be & enquired was acknowledged by Petitioner, but the

failed to attend as directed
though he was present in
his village at the time
the amildar inspected.
This has been reported
to the deputy Commr.
Vide report No 1278 dated
9th December 1890.
The lands have been
inspected and found
correct and the fact reported
Vide No 1248 dated 9th
December 1890.
The lands in Naranahalli
village were in his khata
till they were sold for de-
fault of revenue.
The same remark
applies to 3 pieces of lands
in Chikmahalli village.
Lands No 38 Situate
in the Madhavagere
village was in the
enjoyment of Siddegowda
from the beginning of
the year "Virodhi" it
was transferred to
Siddegowda's khata
according to the "wrong
Registration of Petitions"
Land No 123 was

in petitioners Khata and sold by auction for arrears of Kandayam.

Petitioner appealed that Naranahalli Chick Loobrayas land which has been sold to him was put up for sale fraudulently upon which buyers order No 1248/1417 Calling for the proceedings of the said Sale was received. The proceedings were sent. There was no necessity for sending any other proceedings

This has been explained in reply No 1.

(2) When petitioner first appealed the records of all the Cases connected with him were not sent but only the proceedings connected with the sale of Naranahalli Chick Rasoobrayas land alone was sent and petitioner has been defrauded in Consequence

(3) Petitioner has complained that the Taluk Authorities have failed to Carry out orders about inspection of his lands and that they are assisting the present Shanbog. Petitioner also refers to endorsements Nos 930 and 408 of the District Office

(4) That he did not suppress the village accounts nor has he lost

The Shanbogue reported that he lost the accounts of 1901 24 years

lost them as alleged by the Amildar, as a perusal of the following documents will show.

(1) Petition presented by petitioner in 1880-81 to the Taluk

(2) Report made in 1883/84

(3) Records in Criminal Case No 5 of 1883/84

That petitioner was under custody in '83 when the Killedar Govindappa and Head Gumastah Nanjappa searched petitioner's house and took away all the accounts. That petitioner asked for their return but they were not given him and that the endorsements under reference are in reply to petitioners' prayer for the return of the accounts

5) In the endorsement given to petitioner there is the total amount mentioned which is said

years on his way to the Taluk Cutcherry from Varuna, which is improbable as it is not at all usual for a Shanbog who comes to the Taluk Cutcherry to carry the accounts of 20 years with him and as it is frequently found that he does not bring the accounts of a single year, Compton, his statement that he lost the accounts of 19 or 20 years in his way cannot therefore be believed. During the "Judi" of petitioners' house the accounts of Chikka bhanna and Subbanna alone were found. The former Amildar gave them to the present Shanbog for "Dakhala".

In regard to the account of "Dasth" made out in the Taluk, petitioner asked for and

Said to have been engaged by him. Petitioner asked for details as to what years accounts the arrears referred to, and to which depots. He received an endorsement No (408) that no copy would be given. The amount not actually due and the amounts remitted have not been deducted from the amount shown against him. The amount misappropriated by 2nd and 4th depots were concealed in the deceptive report made to the Deputy Collector who did not give copy nor made an enquiry but trusted the Amildar's report.

no copy from the Taluq nor was any endorsement given him by the Taluq. The endorsement alluded to was given the petitioner by the Deputy Collector.

(6) Petitioner does not owe any thing. The present Shanbog Sri Mastak is a very wicked man. As an instance when the same man was a Jamnasla to Sriambog Shankaria

Petitioner reported loss of all records. Where does the account of Bhatu, Eswara, & Bhalodanya which he has now to Come from & Can they be believed

of Rangasamudra in the Sirainkudi Nasiyam Taluk — his fraudulent conduct was discovered by the Auditors and reported after enquiry (Report No 551 dated 25.11.83 This report petitioner begs may be referred to. Petitioner puts up "Vasul" and "Baki" petties of Dhali Iswara and Babu Danya. a scrutiny of these he says will show no "dasth" (embezzlement) at all and petitioner

V5

denies the demand stated - ment for the years "within" petitioner made a "Shara" saying that he would account for the amount said to have been paid by the ryots against whom no demands were shown in the baki putti or make the amount good. Not having done so petitioner's house was searched when only the Khote and Kudi for Chitrabhanu and Ewabhanu were found and the amount of "Dasth" (embezzlement) made out therefrom. The accounts for the 3 years beginning with "Dhali" were said to have been lost. How these came now which were not forth coming at the time of the search is difficult to say. The present Shanbog was appointed acting first

first and being found, fit was confirmed afterwards by the present Amildar's predecessor.

(7) If any "dasth" (embezzlement) had been really made ask for the above years as stated by the 1st and 4th defendants why was the same not mentioned at the time of enquiry and why were no records produced? This is a new creation of the 4th defd requiring enquiry

When the prosecution was set about by Mr. K. Ramaswami Ayyangar Amildar, the amount known at the time to have been embezzled was mentioned and was the subject of the prosecution

(8) The 4th defendant has been exerting extraordinary influence on 1st defendant and has shown personal "zid" against petitioner, which petitioner cannot account for. 4th defendant got facts concocted and enquiry will show his nefarious attempts to bring about petitioners ruin

The embezzlement referred to in para no 6 were found out by the present Shanbogue when the incomplete accounts found in petitioners' house and the demand Statement at the Taluk Cutcherry. The present Shanbogue works properly & gives no room for complaint on the ryots. This was of the previous read

17 recommending him.

(9) The 1st defendant reported that unless the attendance of the 3rd defendant was produced the accounts could not be adjusted. 3rd defendant had been transferred to Elavalai. He came and made out a "Sanjayishipatti" and gave his report. Objection was taken to this report. What he wrote and what the Shernistedar wrote were set aside by the present amildar who based his report on 4th defendant's statement. Why the amildar showed such enmity, the petitioner cannot say but it is for the authorities to consider. Petitioner submits list of Sanjayishipatti given by 3rd defendant.

"If there were any
, for the years
ward, and
ya, why did
not

The amounts shown against petitioner are exclusive of those items which were to be struck off as per accounts prepared by Revenue Inspector. At perusal of report No 1287 is requested.

All necessary steps taken according to the procedure laid down and confirmed by the higher authorities

not the 2nd defendant who was the Jamadar in charge of the Hobli. Get notice issued, property attached and sold?

(11) Why was no intimation given to the respective hobblies of the amounts remitted, to be remitted, and the amount realized in Sale and why were not the said amounts written against the demands in the accounts of the respective villages? If the above arrears were due until the year Vishu why were no steps taken until then for their recovery. What Shara has been made as "baki patti" given by petitioner? A perusal of the records will disclose the truth. This record has been concealed.

Wherever the accounts disclosed details, Kuwar, remission, attachment and Sale have been carried out the usual procedure has been followed also as regards petitioners' arrear

(12) While 2nd defendant was Taluk Jamadar Items remitted Certain items were "Jafti" and ordered in form no 7 "credits" have been excluded

to be remitted. In such cases probably has again been "jufted" and sold.

13) 2nd and 3 defendant were Taluk Sunnaslahs. 3rd defendant gave evidence against petitioners in criminal prosecution in 1883. If arrears upto the year viz 1881-82 remained due why was no question raised about them? — This is fictitious "baki" based upon the fraudulent statement prepared by the 1st defendant. The petitioners' lands have been sold for such fictitious "baki". Petitioner was not informed how much was the "baki" amount. He begs for perusal of these proceedings.

The revenue Sunnaslahs who were in this Taluk at the time namely Aswatha Rao and 3rd Sunnasta Narsingrao have been transferred, one to Chalvadi and the other to Turankudlu Narsipur Taluks. — Replies to these queries have been given in Paragraph No 7.

Whenever ryots pay money for their Cowdays an in the Talug

they are not appropriated without intimation — being given to the Mobi. no question is raised for 5 or 6 years, and then a complaint is raised that no money was received. Petitioner is unable to recount all the instances of such irregularities. Petitioner addressed petitions to the Deputy Commr who returned them to him without replies, and those petitions petitioner has herewith submitted. He prays for the perusal of these as also of petition submitted with petition no 1720.

the same is credited in the "Rojadi" and endorsement given as well as intimation to Sheristadar and Shanbogue.

(15) Collection was made from the ryots now according to the "Khata" and "Koiadi" and "baki patti" given by the petitioner but they have made out "accounts

the collection was made on the "baki patti" given by petitioner and by him.

Petitioner can because his la sold for his d

accounts just as they - 21/ and also for those
liked showing arrears of other Government
against people who ryots whose payments
had nothing to pay. A petitions did not -
perusal and comparison account for.
of the "Khate" kirad
and bakipatti" made
out by the defendant
with the "baki patti" given
by petitioner, form no 7
"Jafti patti" he will -
shew the irregularities.

Krishniengar
2nd General Asst Comm
Mysore District

22

Appellant. No. 2792
Subbaroya, late Shanbogue of
Madavagere, Mysore Taluk.

Endorsement. 8/15/12/90

Section L.R
File No 45989
Serial No 4

In reply to his Petition dated 20th March/90 Petitioner
is informed that as he, when heard in person
was not able to state exactly what his complaint
was, and that as the records received do not shew
~~is informed that~~ that any injustice was done to him, his petition
is rejected.

The Enclosures are herewith returned.

Section L R
File No 45989
Serial No 5

Mysore Dewan's Office,
Petition Department,
17 Dec. 1890.
10-1-91

By Order,

Secretary.

No. 11038 P. 852.
642 6 vvs.
Copy to the D.C. Comm., Mysore D., with the vvr: papers
with his No. 893 dy. 10. 90.

By order

Under Secretary